



Case 3:07-cv-05696-SI Document 16 Filed 02/12/2008 Page 1 of 7

Sanford Jay Rosen, State Bar No. 62566  
Maria V. Morris, State Bar No. 223903  
Lori E. Rifkin, State Bar No. 244081  
ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP  
315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-6830  
Facsimile: (415) 433-7104  
srosen@rbg-law.com

[Additional Counsel Listed on Following Page]

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND DIVISION

CLAUDE BRYANT, CRAIG FULCHER,  
SANFORD LEVINE and THOMAS  
THOMPSON, on behalf of themselves and all  
other employees and former employees similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALDERWOODS GROUP, INC., SERVICE  
CORPORATION INTERNATIONAL, SCI  
FUNERAL AND CEMETERY PURCHASING  
COOPERATIVE, INC., SCI EASTERN  
MARKET SUPPORT CENTER, L.P., SCI  
WESTERN MARKET SUPPORT CENTER, L.P.  
a/k/a SCI WESTERN MARKET SUPPORT  
CENTER, INC., SCI HOUSTON MARKET  
SUPPORT CENTER, L.P., JANE D. JONES,  
GWEN PETTEWAY, THOMAS RYAN, PAUL  
A. HOUSTON and CURTIS BRIGGS,

Defendants.

) Case No. CV 07-5696

) PLAINTIFFS' CASE MANAGEMENT  
) STATEMENT

Case 3:07-cv-05696-SI Document 16 Filed 02/12/2008 Page 2 of 7

1 Additional Attorneys for Plaintiffs, who will submit  
2 applications for admission *pro hac vice*:

3 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660  
4 Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870  
5 DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP  
6 693 East Avenue  
7 Rochester, NY 14607  
8 Telephone: (585) 272-0540  
9 Facsimile: (585) 272-0574  
10 psolomon@theemploymentattorneys.com

11 Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No.19938  
12 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654  
13 MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN  
14 525 William Penn Place  
15 Suite 3300  
16 Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
17 Telephone: (412) 281-4256  
18 Facsimile: (412) 642-2380  
19 csaul@margolisedelstein.com  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Plaintiffs submit this case management statement in lieu of the joint case management  
2 statement because Defendants have not yet been served. The deadline for service of the  
3 Complaint under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is March 10, 2008. Plaintiffs may also file  
4 an Amended Complaint prior to the Complaint being served. Plaintiffs are prepared to attend the  
5 Case Management Conference. However, Plaintiffs are also amenable to a continuance of the  
6 Case Management Conference until all parties have been served.

7 Plaintiffs expect that this statement will be amended, or a joint statement will be submitted,  
8 after issue has been joined in this case.

9 **1. Jurisdiction and Service**

10 This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiffs' claims because they arise out of  
11 violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act and therefore present a federal question. Defendants  
12 have not yet been served, and Plaintiffs intend to serve the Complaint by March 10, 2008.  
13 Plaintiffs may also file an Amended Complaint prior to the Complaint being served.

14 **2. Facts**

15 Plaintiffs Claude Bryant, et al., on behalf of themselves and other employees similarly  
16 situated ("Plaintiffs") were employed by Defendants. Plaintiffs allege that, while they were  
17 employed by Defendants, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs overtime wages for overtime hours  
18 worked and failed to provide accurate wage statements.

19 The Complaint sets out Plaintiffs' claims pursuant to the FLSA concerning maintenance of  
20 records. Plaintiffs seek to represent a proposed class of current and former employees of  
21 Defendants who were employed by Defendants and subject to Defendants' improper pay policies.

22 **3. Legal Issues**

23 The legal issues in this case concern whether the Defendants violated the FLSA, 29 U.S.C.  
24 § 201 *et seq.* by failing to pay employees for overtime hours pursuant to various policies  
25 maintained by Defendants. For example, Defendants required plaintiffs to perform work, such as  
26 on-call work, community work, training and other work, without pay. The legal issues also  
27 include whether the Defendants violated the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* by failing to maintain  
28

1 proper records that adequately and accurately reflect hours worked each day and each week, and  
2 overtime compensation.

3 **4. Motions**

4 Currently, there are no pending motions. Plaintiffs will likely submit a motion seeking to  
5 send court-authorized notice to similarly situated employees. As the case moves forward, there  
6 may be motions related to discovery, summary judgment motions, and motions on the pleadings.

7 **5. Amendment of Pleadings**

8 Plaintiffs may amend their Complaint prior to service. However plaintiffs propose that the  
9 deadline to amend pleadings after service be set at a date after the close of discovery.

10 **6. Evidence Preservation**

11  
12 This issue is more properly directed to Defendants who likely have records concerning the  
13 issues in this case, such as the time worked by their employees and how much they were paid.

14 **7. Disclosures**

15 As the defendants have not yet been served, initial disclosures have not yet been made.

16 **8. Discovery**

17 To date, no discovery has been completed in this case. Plaintiffs propose that discovery  
18 commence after plaintiffs' motion for conditional certification of the FLSA claims. Plaintiffs  
19 propose that the date by which plaintiffs are to submit their motion for conditional certification be  
20 set as May 5, 2008. After such motion is determined, plaintiffs proposed that a conference be held  
21 with the Court to develop a schedule for discovery.

22 **9. Class Actions**

23 This case is a collective action under the FLSA. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), other  
24 employees may opt into this action. Plaintiffs suggest that the deadline for their motion for  
25 conditional certification of a collective action be set as May 5, 2008.

26  
27 //  
28

1  
2           **10.    Related Cases**

3           Two cases arising out of employment practices of these defendants are currently being  
4 litigated in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda. These are Bryant, et  
5 al. v. Service Corporation, et al. (Case No. RG 07359593) and Helm, et al. v. Alderwoods Group,  
6 Inc., et al (Case No. RG 07359602). However, those cases present only state law claims, and the  
7 FLSA claims of the Plaintiffs in the instant case are not being litigated in those cases or in any  
8 other court. Plaintiffs split their state and federal law claims based on a ruling by the Western  
9 District of Pennsylvania in a similar case in which the federal court declined to exercise  
10 supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims.

11           As disclosed in Plaintiffs' Notice of Pendency of Other Actions, filed November 8, 2007,  
12 at the time this case was filed, there were two actions pending in federal courts which involved a  
13 material part of the same subject matter as the instant action, in that all of these proceedings  
14 related to the defendants' policies and practices regarding their employees' overtime pay. The first  
15 action, *Prise, et al. v. Alderwoods Group, Inc., et al.* (W.D.Pa. 06-cv-1641)("Prise I"), is a  
16 collective action under the Fair Labor Standards Act brought by defendants' current and former  
17 employees. None of the Plaintiffs in the instant action are parties to the *Prise I* litigation and  
18 because the opt-in period in that case has passed for most of the Plaintiffs in the instant action,  
19 they are not eligible to participate in the *Prise I* action. The second action, *Prise v. Alderwoods*  
20 *Group, Inc., et al.*, (N.D.Cal. 07-cv-5140)("Prise II") was a class action brought by current and  
21 former employees for violation of various states' wage and hour laws, as well as for violations of  
22 state common laws. That case was voluntarily dismissed without prejudice on December 5, 2007.  
23 None of the Plaintiffs in the instant action were named plaintiffs in the *Prise II* action.

24           **11.    Relief**

25           Plaintiffs seek to recover all overtime compensation denied them because of Defendants'  
26 policies. In addition, Plaintiffs seek liquidated damages in an equal amount. Further, Plaintiffs  
27 are entitled to attorneys' fees and costs. Plaintiffs will also seek any other damages to which they  
28 are entitled under federal or state law. It is premature to estimate the total amount of damages.

12. **Settlement and ADR**

At the present time, given that Defendants have not yet been served, no settlement discussions have occurred. Most likely, the appropriate time for the parties to engage in settlement discussions would be after a decision has been rendered on plaintiffs' Motion for Conditional Certification.

13. **Consent to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction**

Because defendants have not yet been served, the parties have not discussed whether they will consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction.

14. **Other References**

Plaintiffs do not believe the case is suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master or multidistrict litigation.

15. **Narrowing of Issues**

Because defendants have not yet been served, the parties have not discussed whether the issues can be narrowed by agreement or by motion or how to expedite the presentation of evidence at trial.

16. **Expedited Schedule**

Plaintiffs do not believe this case can be handled on an expedited basis, except their motion for conditional certification should be given expedited consideration due to statute of limitations issues.

17. **Scheduling**

Plaintiffs propose that deadlines for designation of experts, discovery cutoff, hearing of dispositive motions, pretrial conference and trial be set after a decision is rendered on their motion for conditional certification.

18. **Trial**

Plaintiffs have demanded a jury trial. Plaintiffs believe the trial may last up to one month.

19. **Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons**

Other than the parties, including the putative class members, plaintiffs are not aware of any other person, firm, partnership or corporation with a financial interest in the subject matter in

Case 3:07-cv-05696-SI Document 16 Filed 02/12/2008 Page 7 of 7

1 controversy or in a party to the proceeding or any other kind of interest that could be substantially  
2 affected by the outcome of this proceeding.

3 Respectfully Submitted,

4  
5 ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP

6 Date: February 12, 2008

7 By: /s/ Lori Rifkin

8 Sanford Jay Rosen, State Bar No. 62566  
9 Maria V. Morris, State Bar No. 223903  
10 Lori E. Rifkin, State Bar No. 244081  
11 315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor  
12 San Francisco, CA 94104  
13 Telephone: (415) 433-6830

14 DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP  
15 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660  
16 Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870  
17 693 East Avenue  
18 Rochester, NY 14607  
19 Telephone: (585) 272-0540

20 MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN  
21 Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No. 19938  
22 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654  
23 525 William Penn Place, Suite 3300  
24 Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
25 Telephone: (412) 281-4256  
26 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
27  
28



**EXHIBIT P**

Case 3:07-cv-05696-SI Document 3 Filed 11/08/2007 Page 1 of 4

Sanford Jay Rosen, State Bar No. 62566  
Maria V. Morris, State Bar No. 223903  
Lori E. Rifkin, State Bar No. 244081  
ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP  
315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-6830  
Facsimile: (415) 433-7104  
srosen@rbg-law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

[Additional Counsel Listed on Following Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND DIVISION

CLAUDE BRYANT, CRAIG FULCHER,  
SANFORD LEVINE and THOMAS  
THOMPSON,  
on behalf of themselves  
and all employees similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

- vs -

ALDERWOODS GROUP, INC., SERVICE  
CORPORATION INTERNATIONAL, SCI  
FUNERAL AND CEMETERY PURCHASING  
COOPERATIVE, INC., SCI EASTERN  
MARKET SUPPORT CENTER, L.P., SCI  
WESTERN MARKET SUPPORT CENTER,  
L.P. a/k/a SCI WESTERN MARKET  
SUPPORT CENTER, INC., SCI HOUSTON  
MARKET SUPPORT CENTER, L.P., JANE D.  
JONES, GWEN PETTEWAY, THOMAS  
RYAN, PAUL A. HOUSTON and CURTIS  
BRIGGS,

Defendants.

ORIGINAL  
FILED  
07 NOV -8 PM 3:44  
RECEIVED W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CV 07

MEJ

5696

NOTICE OF PENDENCY  
OF OTHER ACTIONS  
Local Rule 3-13

1 Additional Attorneys for Plaintiffs, who will  
2 submit applications for admission *pro hac vice*:

3 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660  
4 Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870  
5 DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP  
6 693 East Avenue  
7 Rochester, NY 14607  
8 Telephone: (585) 272-0540  
9 Facsimile: (585) 272-0574  
10 psolomon@theemploymentattorneys.com

11 Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No. 19938  
12 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654  
13 MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN  
14 525 William Penn Place  
15 Suite 3300  
16 Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
17 Telephone: (412) 281-4256  
18 Facsimile: (412) 642-2380  
19 csaul@margolisedelstein.com  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1                                    NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTIONS

2            Pursuant to Local Rule 3-13, Plaintiffs hereby notify this Court of two actions currently  
3 pending in federal courts which involve a material part of the same subject matter as the instant  
4 action, in that all of these proceedings relate to the defendant's policies and practices regarding  
5 their employees' overtime pay.

6            The first action, *Prise v. Alderwoods Group, Inc. et al.*, 07-cv-1641 (W.D.P.A., filed  
7 December 8, 2006) ("Prise I"), is a collective action under the Fair Labor Standards Act  
8 brought by defendants' current and former employees. None of the plaintiffs in the instant  
9 action are parties to the Prise I litigation. In fact, by order of the Prise I court, the opt-in period  
10 in that case has passed for most of the plaintiffs in the instant action, and therefore most of the  
11 plaintiffs in this action are not eligible to participate in the Prise I action.

12            The second action, *Prise v. Alderwoods Group, Inc. et al.*, 07-cv-5140 (N.D. Cal., filed  
13 October 5, 2007) ("Prise II"), is a class action brought by current and former employees for  
14 violations of various states' wage and hour laws, as well as for violations of state common  
15 laws. The claims in Prise II were initially asserted in the Prise I action but, at the defendants'  
16 request, the Prise I court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over these claims.  
17 Prise II was then filed in state court and was subsequently removed to federal court by the  
18 defendants. Neither of the federal law claims asserted in the instant action are at issue in Prise  
19 II, which involves only state law claims that have been removed to federal court. None of the  
20 plaintiffs in the instant action are currently named plaintiffs in Prise II although, in the event  
21 that a class is certified in Prise II, some of the plaintiffs in the instant action may also become  
22 class members in that action.

23            Transfer should not be effected pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 because the common  
24 questions of fact between the instant case and Prise I, the federal case in Pennsylvania, are not  
25 sufficiently complex to warrant transfer. Furthermore, the accompanying discovery is not so  
26 time consuming that transfer would serve the convenience of parties and witnesses or promote  
27 just and efficient conduct of the litigation. Additionally, defendants previously argued that the  
28

Case 3:07-cv-05696-SI Document 3 Filed 11/08/2007 Page 4 of 4

1 state law claims raised in *Prise II* are inherently incomparable with the federal law claims  
2 raised in *Prise I* and in the instant action.

3 Respectfully Submitted,

4 ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP

5  
6 Date: November 8, 2007

7 By: 

8 Sanford Jay Rosen, State Bar No. 62566  
9 Maria V. Morris, State Bar No. 223903  
10 Lori E. Rifkin, State Bar No. 244081  
11 315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor  
12 San Francisco, CA 94104  
13 Telephone: (415) 433-6830

14 DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP  
15 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660  
16 Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870  
17 693 East Avenue  
18 Rochester, NY 14607  
19 Telephone: (585) 272-0540

20 MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN  
21 Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No. 19938  
22 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654  
23 525 William Penn Place, Suite 3300  
24 Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
25 Telephone: (412) 281-4256

26 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT Q**

Sanford Jay Rosen, State Bar No. 62566  
Maria V. Morris, State Bar No. 223903  
Lori E. Rifkin, State Bar No. 244081  
ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP  
315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-6830  
Facsimile: (415) 433-7104  
srosen@rbg-law.com

[Additional Counsel Listed on Following Page]

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND DIVISION

WILLIAM HELM, DEBORAH PRISE,  
HEATHER P. RADY, et al., on behalf of  
themselves and all other employees and former  
employees similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALDERWOODS GROUP, INC., PAUL A.  
HOUSTON, SERVICE CORPORATION  
INTERNATIONAL, SCI FUNERAL AND  
CEMETERY PURCHASING  
COOPERATIVE, INC., SCI EASTERN  
MARKET SUPPORT CENTER, L.P., SCI  
WESTERN MARKET SUPPORT CENTER,  
L.P. a/k/a SCI WESTERN MARKET  
SUPPORT CENTER, INC., and SCI  
HOUSTON MARKET SUPPORT CENTER,  
L.P.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 08-1184 JSW

**PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT IN  
SUPPORT OF RELATING CASES**

1 Additional Attorneys for Plaintiffs, who will  
2 submit applications for admission *pro hac vice*:

3 J. Nelson Thomas, NY Attorney No. 2579159  
4 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660  
5 Michael J. Lingle, NY Attorney No. 3925765  
6 Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870  
7 Justin Cordello, NY Attorney No. 4131447  
8 DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP  
693 East Avenue  
Rochester, NY 14607  
Telephone: (585) 272-0540  
Facsimile: (585) 272-0574  
nthomas@theemploymentattorneys.com

9 Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No.19938  
10 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654  
11 Kyle T. McGee, PA State Bar No. 205661  
12 MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN  
13 525 William Penn Place  
Suite 3300  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Telephone: (412) 281-4256  
Facsimile: (412) 642-2380  
csaul@margolisedelstein.com



1                                   **STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF RELATING CASES**

2           Plaintiffs submit this Statement in Support of Relating Cases in response to Judge  
3 Jeffrey S. White's *sua sponte* Judicial Referral for Purposes of Determining Relationship  
4 of Cases (*see* Case No. 08-1184, Docket No. 26). Plaintiffs respectfully submit that, in  
5 light of the prior decision relating two other actions currently pending in the District Court  
6 for the Northern District of California—*Bryant v. Alderwoods Group, Inc.*, Case No. 07-  
7 5696 (“*Bryant I*”) and *Bryant v. Service Corporation International*, Case No. 08-1190  
8 (“*Bryant II*”)—the instant action (“*Helm*”) should be related to those other actions.

9           Plaintiffs initially filed the claims asserted in *Helm*, *Bryant I* and *Bryant II* together  
10 with other claims in an action in the District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania  
11 captioned *Prise v. Alderwoods Group, Inc.*, Case No. 06-1641 (“*Prise*”). All of the claims  
12 in each of these actions are based upon the allegation that employees who worked at  
13 defendants’ funeral home locations were not properly paid their regular or statutorily  
14 required rates for all the time they worked for defendants.

15           At defendants’ request, however, the *Prise* Court determined that certain claims  
16 would not be heard together in that action. Based upon the *Prise* Court’s rulings, as well  
17 as defendants’ position which resulted in those rulings, plaintiffs refiled certain claims  
18 separately in the *Helm*, *Bryant I* and *Bryant II* actions.

19           However, consistent with plaintiffs’ initial filing and in light of the prior  
20 determination that *Bryant I* and *Bryant II* are related, plaintiffs submit that the *Helm* action  
21 should also be related.

22                                   **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

23           ***Plaintiffs File All Claims Together in the Western District of Pennsylvania***

24           On December 12, 2006, Alderwoods Group, Inc. (“Alderwoods”) and Service  
25 Corporation International (“SCI”), both named defendants in this action, were named in  
26 the *Prise* complaint filed in the Western District of Pennsylvania. Prior to the filing of  
27 *Prise*, SCI had acquired Alderwoods and Alderwoods had become SCI’s wholly-owned  
28

1 subsidiary. After the merger, SCI continued to operate the vast majority of both its own  
2 funeral homes and those of Alderwoods.

3 The *Prise* complaint was filed as a class and collective action alleging, *inter alia*,  
4 that employees who worked at defendants' funeral home locations were not properly paid  
5 for all the time they worked for defendants. It asserted violations of both the Fair Labor  
6 Standards Act ("FLSA") and state wage and hour laws. The *Prise* Court conditionally  
7 certified an FLSA class of employees and directed that notice be sent to certain individuals  
8 who worked or had worked at an Alderwoods location. In response to that notice,  
9 hundreds of current and former employees opted-in to the *Prise* action, including  
10 employees who had worked only at Alderwoods locations, before and/or after SCI's  
11 acquisition ("Alderwoods employees"), and employees who had worked at other SCI  
12 locations unrelated to Alderwoods ("SCI employees").

13 Both Alderwoods and SCI employed a set of practices or policies whereby  
14 employees were not paid their regular or statutorily required rate for all hours worked.  
15 Thus, because of the overlapping legal liability of defendants, as well as the overlapping  
16 factual issues in the matter, plaintiffs believed it was legally appropriate and in the  
17 interests of judicial efficiency for defendants to be named in a common action and for all  
18 of the employees' claims to be brought together.

19  
20 ***Defendants Move to Have Certain Claims Heard Separately***

21 Based on defendants' requests in their motions, the *Prise* Court determined that  
22 certain claims would not be heard together in the *Prise* action. Following these rulings,  
23 plaintiffs refiled those claims in the *Bryant I*, *Helm* and *Bryant II* actions.

24 As an initial matter, in granting plaintiffs' motion for notice the *Prise* Court also  
25 provided a deadline by which individuals who wished to join that action must opt-in.  
26 Employees who asked to assert claims against defendants but could not join the *Prise*  
27 action because of the deadline were joined together with certain other individuals in the  
28 *Bryant I* action.

1 In June, 2007, the *Prise* Court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over  
2 any of the state law claims alleged in the *Prise* action. Therefore, on or about July 9, 2007,  
3 the Alderwoods employees and the SCI employees jointly reasserted their state law claims  
4 in a Class Action Complaint filed in the Superior Court of the State of California for the  
5 County of Alameda. Defendants removed that action to federal District Court for the  
6 Northern District of California as *Prise v. Alderwoods Group, Inc.*, 07-05140 (the  
7 “Combined State Law Action”).

8 Subsequently, the *Prise* Court determined it would only hear claims on behalf of  
9 Alderwoods employees, and that claims of employees who had worked only at other SCI  
10 locations should be heard in a separate action. Based on that ruling, the federal claims of  
11 those SCI employees were refiled in a separate action in the District of Arizona.

12 Based upon defendants’ position that resulted in that ruling, the Combined State  
13 Law Action was voluntarily dismissed so that the state law claims of the Alderwoods  
14 employees could be heard separately from those of the SCI employees—just as the *Prise*  
15 Court had ruled that their federal claims would be filed separately. Those state law claims  
16 were refiled by the Alderwoods employees in *Helm*, while the SCI employees filed their  
17 state law claims in *Bryant II*. Both *Helm* and *Bryant II* were initially filed in state court  
18 and removed to federal district court by defendants.

19 Thus, three actions are now pending in the Northern District of California: *Bryant I*,  
20 which asserts FLSA claims on behalf of Alderwoods employees who were unable to join  
21 the *Prise* action; *Helm*, which asserts the state law claims of Alderwoods employees; and  
22 *Bryant II*, which asserts the state law claims of SCI employees. On March 11, 2008, the  
23 Court ruled that the *Bryant I* and *Bryant II* actions are related. *See Bryant II*, Case No. 08-  
24 1190, Docket No. 27. On March 13, 2008, the *Helm* matter was referred for determination  
25 as to whether it, too, should be related to the *Bryant* actions. *See Helm*, Case No. 08-1184,  
26 Docket No. 26.  
27  
28

**HELM SHOULD BE RELATED TO THE OTHER ACTIONS**

As discussed above, plaintiffs initially filed all of the claims at issue in a single action because plaintiffs believed that the overlapping legal liability of defendants, as well as the overlapping factual issues in the matter, rendered it legally appropriate and in the interests of judicial efficiency for these claims to be brought together. The claims were filed in separate actions only in response to defendants' arguments and positions.

There is significant overlap in the parties to these actions. Although some of the plaintiffs may be neatly defined as either Alderwoods employees or SCI employees, other plaintiffs fall into both categories. Moreover, with the exception of Alderwoods, which is not named in *Bryant II*, there is complete overlap in the corporate defendants in these actions, although individual defendants vary somewhat. Finally, there is significant factual overlap in these cases, which involve similar or identical policies and practices.

Most importantly, the ruling relating the *Bryant I* and *Bryant II* actions weighs in favor of relating the *Helm* action. The plaintiffs in the *Helm* action include the plaintiffs in the *Bryant I* action (and may, to a lesser extent, overlap with the plaintiffs in *Bryant II*). The state law claims at issue in *Helm* are nearly identical to those at issue in *Bryant II*.

Thus, plaintiffs submit that, in light of the determination that *Bryant I* and *Bryant II* are related, *Helm* should also be related in the interest of judicial efficiency.

Respectfully Submitted,  
ROSEN, BIEN & GALVAN, LLP

Date: March 17, 2008

By: /s/ Lori Rifkin

Sanford Jay Rosen, State Bar No. 62566  
Maria V. Morris, State Bar No. 223903  
Lori E. Rifkin, State Bar No. 244081  
315 Montgomery Street, Tenth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-6830

1 DOLIN, THOMAS & SOLOMON LLP  
2 J. Nelson Thomas, NY Attorney No. 2579159  
3 Patrick J. Solomon, NY Attorney No. 2716660  
4 Michael J. Lingle, NY Attorney No. 3925765  
5 Annette Gifford, NY Attorney No. 4105870  
6 Justin Cordello, NY Attorney No. 4131447  
7 693 East Avenue  
8 Rochester, NY 14607  
9 Telephone: (585) 272-0540

10 MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN  
11 Charles H. Saul, PA State Bar No.19938  
12 Liberty J. Weyandt, PA State Bar No. 87654  
13 Kyle T. McGee, PA State Bar No. 205661  
14 525 William Penn Place, Suite 3300  
15 Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
16 Telephone: (412) 281-4256

17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28